UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/562,641	06/14/2006	Prasenjit Sen	U 016085-0	8486	
140 LADAS & PAF	7590 07/20/200 RRY LLP	9	EXAMINER		
26 WEST 61ST	STREET	YANG, JIE			
NEW TORK, I	NEW YORK, NY 10023		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1793		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/20/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/562,641	SEN ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		JIE YANG	1793		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DESIGNS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute the proceived by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 M</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro			
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicat i	Claim(s) 1-10,12-19 and 21 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-19 is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-10 and 21 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examinating The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accompanies and applicant may not request that any objection to the	wn from consideration. or election requirement. er. cepted or b) □ objected to by the lest drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
•	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureasee the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 11 and 20 are cancelled; claims 12-19 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected group; and claims 1-10 and 21 remain for examination. No amendments to the claims have been made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al (JP 04-350107 with machine English translation, thereafter JP'107) in view of Akiyoshi (JP 02-166202, thereafter JP'202).

JP'107 in view of JP'202 is applied to the claims 1-5 and 7-19 for the same reason as stated in the previous rejection dated 12/8/2008.

Claims 5, 6 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP'107 in view of JP'202 as applied to claims 1-5 and 7-10, and further in view of Ryzkov (US 6,884,405 B2, thereafter US'405).

JP'107 in view of JP'202 and US'405 is applied to the claims 5, 6, and 21 for the same reason as stated in the previous rejection dated 12/8/2008.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 5/8/2009 with respect to claims 1-10 and 21 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments are summarized as follows:

- 1) JP'107 does not disclose a process for the production of the metallic nanoparticles because JP'107 discloses a method for producing metal nitride powder and the particles are not described as nanoparticles;
- 2) particles produced in JP'202 are not nanoparticles because they are described as small diameter metal particles having about 0.1 to 0.01 µm diameter; and the arc discharge taught by JP'202 is not same process as recited in the process.
- 3) The process of US'405 differs from the claimed process because the process of spark explosion and the melting the electrodes as recited in the instant claim is different with the arc process as taught by US'405. US'405 doe not teach current density of one million amperes per square meter as recited in the instant claim 6.

Responses are as follows:

Regarding the arguments 1)-3), the applicant's arguments are against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references

Art Unit: 1793

individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In the instant case, JP'107 in view of JP'202 is applied to the claims 1-5 and 7-19 and JP'107 in view of JP'202 and US'405 is applied to the claims 5, 6, and 21, respectively. The Examiner notes that JP'202 teaches that small diameter metal particles have about 0.01 to 0.01 µm diameter (they are about 100nm to 10nm), which fully meets the limitation of nanoparticles as recited in the instant invention (refer to Fig.9 of the instant specification). The Examiner further notes that JP'107 clearly teaches the spark discharge (Paragraph [0010] and Fig. 2 of JP'107), which reads on the spark limitation as recited in the instant claims (also refer to the Fig.4 of the instant specification).

Still regarding argument 3, US'405 teaches the graphite and metal electrodes with variable cross section in order to carry desired arc current 100 to 400A/cm² (Col.22, lines 28-53 of US'405), which is in the level of one million to four million A/m².

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 1793

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jie Yang whose telephone number is 571-270-1884. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-2721244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JY

/Roy King/

Application/Control Number: 10/562,641

Page 6

Art Unit: 1793

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793